

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION ONE

In re D.S., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

D. S.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A147837

(Solano County
Super. Ct. No. J42392)

D.S. appeals from a juvenile court order continuing his wardship and placing him at Challenge Academy after he admitted to violating the terms of his probation. His counsel asked this court to independently review the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436; *In re Kevin S.* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 97, 99 [*Wende* applies in juvenile delinquency appeals].) D.S. was informed of his right to file a supplemental brief and did not do so. We conclude there are no arguable issues and affirm.

In September 2014, D.S., who was then 15 years old, participated in robbing a pedestrian in San Francisco. The San Francisco District Attorney's Office filed a juvenile wardship petition under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 alleging that D.S. had committed two felony offenses, second degree robbery and attempted second

degree robbery.¹ The petition was later amended to allege commission of another felony offense, false imprisonment by violence.² After a contested jurisdictional hearing, the juvenile court found the robbery and false-imprisonment allegations true and the attempted-robbery allegation not true. D.S. was declared a ward of the court, and in March 2015 he was placed at Glen Mills Academy, a residential facility in Pennsylvania.

Eight months later, the probation department filed a motion to revoke probation under Welfare and Institutions Code section 777, subdivision (a). The motion alleged that D.S. had failed to follow the rules of his placement and had been terminated by Glen Mills for “Failure to Adjust.” D.S. admitted to violating the terms of his probation.

In its dispositional report, the probation department recommended that D.S. be committed to Log Cabin Ranch School, but he opposed that placement and submitted a psychological evaluation addressing his need for mental health services and a retained social worker’s alternative dispositional report recommending that he be placed in his mother’s home in Solano County or at the 33rd Avenue Shelter. At a contested dispositional hearing, the juvenile court indicated that it intended to commit D.S. to Log Cabin Ranch School. But after he expressed concern about his ability to succeed there, the court granted his request for the case be transferred to Solano County for disposition.

The supplemental dispositional report recommended that D.S. be committed to the juvenile hall’s Challenge Academy. Another contested dispositional hearing was held, at which a probation officer testified about the services the proposed placement offered and D.S.’s mother testified in support of his placement with her. The juvenile court accepted the probation department’s recommendation and committed D.S. to Challenge Academy. In doing so, the court found that D.S. had tended “to respond pretty well to structured environments” and that Challenge Academy “offer[ed] an extremely wide variety of services that he needs.”

¹ These allegations were made under Penal Code sections 211 and 212.5, subdivision (c) (robbery) and 212.5, subdivision (c) and 664 (attempted robbery).

² This allegation was made under Penal Code section 236.

There are no meritorious issues to be argued on appeal. D.S. admitted to violating the terms of his probation, and based on the record before us the juvenile court's commitment decision was within the scope of its discretion. (See *In re Angela M.* (2003) 111 Cal.App.4th 1392, 1396.) Nor does any error appear in D.S.'s probation conditions or any other aspect of the court's ruling. The March 10, 2016 dispositional order is therefore affirmed.

Humes, P.J.

We concur:

Dondero, J.

Banke, J.